

district courts must review de novo any articulated grounds to which the litigant appears to take issue.” *Elijah v. Dunbar*, 66 F.4th 454, 460–61 (4th Cir. 2023). Where no specific objections have been filed, or a party’s objections are untimely, the court reviews for clear error only. *Dunlap v. TM Trucking of the Carolinas, LLC*, 288 F. Supp. 3d 654, 662 (D.S.C. 2017); *Leach v. Entzel*, 2019 WL 2870098, at *1 (N.D.W. Va.). On clear error review, the court has no obligation to explain its reasoning for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983).

Given that plaintiff’s objection was untimely, the Court has reviewed the M&R for clear error and is satisfied that there is none on the face of the record. However, even if the Court were to consider plaintiff’s objection, the objection is properly overruled. Plaintiff’s objection is general, conclusory, and frivolous. Plaintiff fails to specifically address the “irreducible constitutional minimum of standing” addressed by the M&R, *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 338 (2016) (internal quotation and citation omitted), and instead refers to the M&R as “gobbledee gook nonsense” [DE 8] at 4. Plaintiff’s untimely objection is overruled, and the M&R is adopted in full.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, the Memorandum and Recommendation of Judge Numbers [DE 7] is ADOPTED, and plaintiff’s complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The Clerk is DIRECTED to close the case.

SO ORDERED, this 1 day of July 2025.


TERRENCE W. BOYLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE